Exhibit C

EXHIBIT C

Defendant Walmart Inc.'s ("Defendant") portion of the Rule 4-3 disclosures are appended on a patent-by-patent basis below. For each term, Walmart provides its intrinsic and extrinsic evidence below. For the avoidance of doubt, Defendant also identifies the claims themselves in which the term appears as relevant intrinsic evidence. Further, for each identified figure, corresponding and related text in the specification should be understand to be identified and incorporated by reference. Where a term contains multiple phrases requiring separate construction, those are individually identified below. Further, Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Finally, Defendant reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position, as well as any intrinsic evidence cited by other defendants against whom R2 is asserting the patents-in-suit.

Each of these reservations are made for and effective with respect to each term below, regardless of whether a specific term includes this disclaimer repeated therein.

EXHIBIT C-1 ('610 Patent)

No.	Claim Term	Claims	Defendant's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
		U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610		
1	**"a plurality of mapping functions that are each user-configurable"**	1, 17, 33, 40	"two or more mapping functions that are individually configurable by a user"	1:20-1:27, 1:31-1:33, 1:42-44, 1:66-2:4, 2:9-2:12, 2:21-2:39, 2:56-2:67, 3:15-3:18, 3:35-3:41, 3:48-4:3, 4:4-4:22; 4:36-4:59, 4:60-5:4, 5:13-5:18, 5:33-39; 5:40-6:17, 6:18-7:23, 8:15-8:24, 8:25-8:27, 8:47-8:52; claims 1, 17, 33, 40; Figs. 1-5

3/9/2010 OA Response, including at 2; 8/17/2010 OA, including at 3-5; 11/17/2010 OA Response, including at 2-11, 13-16; 7/6/2011 OA Response including at 2, 5-16; 11/09/2011 OA Response including at 2, 5-6, 10-12, 14-17.

Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position. |

	U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610			
No.	**Claim Term**	**Claims**	**Defendant's Proposed Construction**	**Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence**
2	**"the first data group is mapped differently than the data of the second data group"**	1, 17	"the mapping functions are different for the first data group and the second data group"	1:22-1:27, 1:31-1:36, 1:66-2:8, 2:56-2:58, 2:61-2:64, 3:15-3:18, 3:25-3:34, 3:35-3:47, 3:48-3:57, 3:58-3:64, 3:65-4:3, 4:9-4:18, 4:23-4:30, 4:40-4:50, 7:40-7:59, 8:15-8:24, 8:25-8:33, 8:47-8:58 3/9/2010 OA Response including at 2, 5-6, 13-15; 8/17/10 OA including at 3-5; 11/17/2010 OA Response at 2, 5-6, 13-16; 4/6/11 OA at 4-5; 7/6/11 OA resp at 2, 5-6, 13-15; 8/9/11 OA including 2-3; 11/09/2011 OA Response including at 2, 5-6, 14-17. Figs. 4, 5 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

3

U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610				
No.	**Claim Term**	**Claims**	**Defendant's Proposed Construction**	**Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence**
3	**"data set"**	1, 17, 33, 34, 40, 41	Indefinite.	1:31-1:33, 1:66-2:2, 2:9-2:12, 2:19-2:21, 2:31-2:35, 2:61-2:64, 3:25-3:62, 4:1-4:3, 4:23-4:30, 4:40-4:47, 7:20-7:23, 7:40-7:59, 8:15-8:24, 8:29-8:33, 8:47-8:52 3/9/2010 OA Response including at 13-15 11/17/2010 OA Response including at 13-16 7/6/2011 OA Response including at 13-16 11/17/2010 OA Response including at 13-16 11/9/2011 OA Response including at 10, 11-12, 14-17 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

	U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610			
No.	**Claim Term**	**Claims**	**Defendant's Proposed Construction**	**Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence**
4	**"data group"**	1–2, 4, 17–18, 33, and 40	"a group of data having the same schema and a mechanism for identifying data from that group (e.g., a group identifier)"	1:31-1:41, 1:54-57; 1:66-2:12, 2:31-2:33, 3:35-4:22, 4:23-4:59, 4:63-4:66, 6:18-7:18, 7:40-7:50, 8:15-8:45; Claim 1-7, 9, 11, 12, 16-24, 28, 32, 33, 40; Figs. 1-5 12/9/2010 OA at 3-6, 9-15, 17-18, 20-23, 28-29; 3/9/2010 OA Response at 2-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15; 8/17/2010 OA 3-10; 11/17/2010 OA Response at 5-6, 8-10, 13-16; 4/6/2011 OA at 4-9; 7/6/2011 OA Response at 2-6, 8-11, 13-16; 8/9/2011 OA at 2-11; 11/9/2011 OA Response at 2-11, 14-17. Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

5

No.	Claim Term	Claims	Defendant's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
			U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610	
5	**"data partition"**	1, 17, 33, 40	"a portion of data from a data group that is the input to a map function"	1:66-2:2, 2:9-2:12, 2:31-2:39, 2:56-2:64, 3:3-3:6, 3:48-3:62, 3:65-4:1, 5:22-5:25, 5:63-5:65

Figs. 1-5

12/9/2009 OA at 6-8, 15-17, 24-25, 27-34; 11/17/2010 OA Response at 13-16; 4/6/2011 OA at 6-7, 10; 7/6/2011 OA Response at 13-16; 8/9/2011 OA at 45, 8-11; 11/09/2011 OA Response at 2-8, 10-17.

Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position. |

6

No.	Claim Term	Claims	Defendant's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
			U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610	
6	"including processing the intermediate data for each data group in a manner that is defined to correspond to that data group, so as to result in a merging of the corresponding different intermediate data based on the key in common"	1	"processing the intermediate data differently based on which data group the intermediate data came from and merging the intermediate data regardless of what data group it came from based on the key in common"	1:17-1:20, 1:22-1:28, 1:34-1:41, 2:2-2:8, 3:41-3:45, 3:48-3:50, 3:58-3:64, 4:1-4:22, 4:23-4:35, 4:36-4:59, 4:60-5:18, 5:19-6:7; 6:18-7:23, 7:61-8:14; 8:24-8:27, 8:29-8:34, 8:47-8:58 Figs 1-5 11/17/2010 OA Response at 13-16 3/9/2010 OA Response at 4, 13-15 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

No.	Claim Term	Claims	Defendant's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
over U.S. Patent No. 8,190,610			
7	**"at least one output data group is a plurality of output data groups"**	2, 18	Indefinite.	3:48-4:22, 6:24-7:18 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

EXHIBIT C-2 ('329 Patent)

No.	Claim Term	Claims	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
span	**U.S. Patent No. 7,698,329**			
1	**"said data includes an abstract describing each document of said plurality of documents"**	4, 11	**"abstract"** = "a short paragraph providing a concise description for a recalled document"	*See, e.g.,* '329 Pat. 4:54-60; Abstract; Fig. 3 and accompanying descriptions; 4:17-50; 6:60-62; 1:60-62; 1:45-59; 3:1-32; Claims 4 and 11. Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

| 2 | "each document of said certain documents containing at least one section that is not used by said search engine for recall and one or more sections that are used by said search engine for recall" | 1, 8 | "recall" = "generating results for a search engine query"

"that is not used by said search engine" = "that is ignored by said search engine"

"at least one section that is not used by said search engine for recall" = "at least one section whose contents are ignored for generating results for a search engine query"

"one or more sections that are used by said search engine for recall" = "one or more sections whose contents are used for generating results for a search engine query"

"section" = "defined portion within the structure of a document" | "recall"
See, e.g., '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14.

See also, Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7.

"that is not used by said search engine"
See, e.g., '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14; and in particular '329 Pat. 3:7-21; 3:51-60; and 4:1-16.

See also, Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action |

| | | | dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7.

"at least one section that is not used by said search engine for recall"
See, e.g., '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:32-49; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 4:17-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14; and in particular '329 Pat. 3:7-21; 3:51-60; and 4:1-16;

See also, Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7.

"one or more sections that are used by said search engine for recall"
See, e.g., '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:32-49; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 4:17-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14. |

11

			See also, Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7. **"section"** *See, e.g.*, '329 Pat. 2:28-37; 3:7-31, 3:32-49; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-60; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14. *See also*, Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7. Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant

				also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.
3	**"wherein ranking a plurality of documents includes ranking said plurality of documents based, at least in part, on the at least one section of said certain documents not used by said search engine to recall documents"**	1, 8	**"at least one section of said certain documents not used by said search engine to recall documents"** = "at least one section whose contents are ignored for generating results for a search engine query"	**"at least one section of said certain documents not used by said search engine to recall documents"** *See, e.g.,* '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:32-49; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 4:17-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14; and in particular '329 Pat. 3:7-21; 3:51-60; and 4:1-16. *See also,* Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7. Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position

13

| 4 | "for each respective abstract of each document of said certain documents, said abstract excludes terms from the respective at least one section not used by said search engine to recall said each document" | 4, 11 | "abstract" =

 "a short paragraph providing a concise description for a recalled document"

 "at least one section not used by said search engine to recall said each document" =

 "at least one section whose contents are ignored for generating results for a search engine query" | "abstract"

 See, e.g., '329 Pat. 4:54-60; Abstract; Fig. 3 and accompanying descriptions; 4:17-50; 6:60-62; 1:60-62; 1:45-59; 3:1-32; Claims 4 and 11.

 "at least one section not used by said search engine to recall said each document"

 See, e.g., '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:32-49; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 4:17-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14; and in particular '329 Pat. 3:7-21; 3:51-60; and 4:1-16.

 See also, Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7.

 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic |

14

				evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.
5	"document"	1, 4-5, 8, 11-12	Plain and ordinary meaning; to the extent a construction is warranted, the construction should include the full description: "A document is any unit of information that may be indexed by search engine indexes, which are described below. Often a document is a file which may contain plain or formatted text, inline graphics, and other multimedia data, and hyperlinks to other documents. A document may conform to XML (Extensible Mark-up Language, as promulgated by the WorldWideWeb Consortium), HTML (Hypertext Markup Language), or other public or private standard (e.g. PDF, Portable Document Format by Adobe™, MS Word by Microsoft™). Documents may be static or dynamically generated."	1:34-44; see, also, e.g., '329 Pat. 2:3-5; 1:18 – 2:1; 2:6-11; 2:28-37; 3:1-7; 3:7-31; 3:32-49; 3:50-67; 4:1-16; 4:17-19; 4:54-60; 4:17-60; 6:60-62; Abstract; Figs. 1-3 and accompanying descriptions; Claims 1-14; Notice of Allowance (Feb. 1, 2010), remarks at p. 2-3; Interview Summary (Dec. 9, 2009); Response to Final Office Action dated Nov. 9, 2009 (Jan. 4, 2010), remarks at p. 6-8; Final Office Action (Nov. 9, 2010), remarks at p. 2-4, 6-7; Response to Non-Final Office Action dated May 13, 2009 (Jul. 10, 2009), remarks at p. 6-8; Non-Final Office Action (May 13, 2009), remarks at p. 2-7. Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position

15

EXHIBIT C-3 ('157 Patent)

U.S. Patent No. 8,341,157				
No.	Claim Term	Claims	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
1	**"Intents"**	1-3	Indefinite.	3:46-57 4:19-23 9:1-5 9:44-48 10:11-15 15:30-16:2 All claims in which the term appears or claims from which the term depends USPTO Nonfinal Rejection Filed 10/5/2011 Applicant Arguments, Claims, and Specification Filed 12/23/2011 at 2, 8, 10-12; U.S. Patent No. 7,689,585 to Zeng at each portion discussed as anticipating/rendering obvious the claims in prosecution. USPTO Final Rejection dated 2/21/2012 Applicant RCE Filed 5/18/12 at 3, 9, 11-13 USPTO NOA 9/24/2012 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

U.S. Patent No. 8,341,157				
No.	Claim Term	Claims	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
2	**"Determining, at least the one computing device, a plurality of intents from the at least one keyword, each of the plurality of intents indicates a type of information regarding the query keyword that is likely to be desired by a user submitting the query"**	1	Indefinite.	1:34-52 3:48-52 4:19-23 9:1-5 10:11-15 Fig. 2, Fig. 3 All claims in which the term appears or claims from which the term depends USPTO Nonfinal Rejection Filed 10/5/2011 Applicant Arguments, Claims, and Specification Filed 12/23/2011 at 2, 8, 10-12; U.S. Patent No. 7,689,585 to Zeng at each portion discussed as anticipating/rendering obvious the claims in prosecution. USPTO Final Rejection dated 2/21/2012 Applicant RCE Filed 5/18/12 at 3, 9, 11-13 USPTO NOA 9/24/2012 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

U.S. Patent No. 8,341,157				
No.	Claim Term	Claims	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
3	**"wherein the at least one intent comprises an unclassified intent"**	3	"wherein the at least one intent comprises an intent for which no defined intents match the query"	9:42-44 5:6-9 All claims in which the term appears or claims from which the term depends USPTO Nonfinal Rejection Filed 10/5/2011 Applicant Arguments, Claims, and Specification Filed 12/23/2011 at 2, 8, 10-12; U.S. Patent No. 7,689,585 to Zeng at each portion discussed as anticipating/rendering obvious the claims in prosecution. USPTO Final Rejection dated 2/21/2012 Applicant RCE Filed 5/18/12 at 3, 9, 11-13 USPTO NOA 9/24/2012 Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.

| 4 | "the query is classified by linguistic analysis of the at least one query word." | 5 | Indefinite. | Abstract
1:35-50
1:57-2:17
9:25-41

All claims in which the term appears or claims from which the term depends

USPTO Nonfinal Rejection Filed 10/5/2011

Applicant Arguments, Claims, and Specification Filed 12/23/2011 at 2, 8, 10-12; U.S. Patent No. 7,689,585 to Zeng at each portion discussed as anticipating/rendering obvious the claims in prosecution.

USPTO Final Rejection dated 2/21/2012

Applicant RCE Filed 5/18/12 at 3, 9, 11-13

USPTO NOA 9/24/2012

V. R. Rathod, S. M. Shah, & Nileshkumar K. Modi, *Current Status & Process in the Development of Applications Through NLP*, 3rd Int'l Convention on Automation of Libraries in Education and Research Institutions (CALIBER) at 109-116 (Feb. 2005).

G.J.M. Kruijff, P. Lison, T. Benjamin, H. Jacobsson, and N.A. Hawes, *Incremental, multi-level processing for comprehending* |

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>

situated dialogue in human-robot interaction, Proceedings of the Symposium on Language and Robots in 2007, pp. 55-64 (Luis Seabra Lopes, Tony Belpaeme, and Stephen J. Cowley, eds.) (Dec. 2007)

Gábor Prószéky & András Földes, *Between Understanding and Translating: A Context-Sensitive Comprehension Tool*, 15 Archive of Control Sciences 637-44 (2005)

Sarah Yates, *Scaling the Tower of Babel Fish: An Analysis of the Machine Translation of Legal Information*, 98 Law. Libr. J. 481-500 (2006).

Fiorella de Rosis, Anton Batliner, Nicole Novielli, and Stefan Steidl, *'You are Sooo Cool, Valentina!' Recognizing Social Attitude in Speech-Based Dialogues with an ECA* in Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction: Proceedings of the Second Int'l Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction at 179-90 (Paiva et al. eds.) (Sept. 2007).

Xavier Tannier, Jean-Jacques Girardot, and Mihaela Mathieu, *Classifying XML Tags through "Reading Contexts"*, DocEng '05: Proceedings of the 2005 ACM symposium on Document Engineering pp.143–145 (November 2005)

</td></tr>
</table>

21

| | | | | Turky N. Al-Otaiby, Mohsen AlSherif, and Walter P. Bond, *Toward Software Requirements Modularization Using Hierarchical Clustering Techniques*, ACM-SE 43: Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Southeast Regional Conference of the Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 223–228 (March 2005).

Giovanni Cozzolongo, Berardina De Carolis, Sebastiano Pizzutilo, *Social Robots as Mediators between Users and Smart Environments*, ACM-IUI '07: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, pp. 353–356(January 2007)

Michel Paradis, *Just Reasonable: Can Linguistic Analysis Help Us Know What It Is To Be Reasonable?*, 47 Jurimetrics 169-191 (Winter 2007).

Johannes Leveling, *The Role of Information Retrieval in the Question Answering System IRSAW*, LWA 2006: Proceedings of the Conference on Lernen, Wissensentdeckung und Adaptivität (2006)

Rachel Panckhurst, *Mediated electronic discourse and computational linguistic analysis: improving learning through choice of effective communication methods*, 2006 Proceedings of the Ascilite Conference |

| | | | entitled "Who's Learning? Whose Technology?" pp.633-637 (Dec 2006).

Yishai Tobin, *Comparing and contrasting Natural Phonology with the theory of Phonology as Human Behavior*, Proceedings of 16th International Congress of Phonetics Sciences (ICPhS XVI), pp. 103-106 (August 2007)

Matthew L. Jensen, Judee K. Burgoon, Jay F. Nunamaker, Jr., *Computer-aided Credibility Assessment by Novice Lie-Catchers*, AMCIS 2007: Proceedings of the 2007 Americas Conference on Information Systems, pp.1-11 (Dec. 2007)

Federico Neri & Remo Raffaelli, *Text Mining Applied to Multilingual Corpora in Knowledge Mining*, in Knowledge Mining at pp.123-131 (2005) (Sirmakessis ed.)

F. Neri, *Multilingal Text Mining*, 35 Wesset Institute of Tech. Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies 89-94 (2005)

Fuchun Peng, Ralph Weischedel, Ana Licuanan, Jinxi Xu, *Combining Deep Linguistics Analysis and Surface Pattern Learning: A Hybrid Approach to Chinese Definitional Question Answering*, 2005 Association for Computational Linguistics Proceedings of Human Language |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (HLT/EMNLP), pp. 307–314 (October 2005)

Guy De Pauw, *Optimized version of the morpho-syntactic language model Technical implementation and test results*, CNTS – Language Technology Group at the University of Antwerp, pp. 1-21 (Nov. 24, 2006)

Elizabeth Zeitoun and Ching-Hua Yu, *The Formosan Language Archive: Linguistic Analysis and Language Processing*, 10 Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing 167-200 (June 2005)

Dina Bitton, Franz Faerber, Laura Haas, and Jayavel Shanmugasundaram, *One Platform for Mining Structured and Unstructured Data: Dream or Reality?*, ACM-VLDB 2006: Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (Sept. 2006)

John Judge, *Adapting and Developing Linguistic Resources for Question Answering*, A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of Doctor of Philosophy to the Dublin City University School of Computing (Dec. 2006). |

			Maria Teresa Pazienza, Marco Pennacchiotti, and Fabio Massimo Zanzotto, *Terminology Extraction: An Analysis of Linguistic and Statistical Approaches,* in Knowledge Mining at pp.255-279 (2005) (Sirmakessis ed.) S. Tachaphetpiboon, N. Facundes and T. Amornraksa, *Plagiarism Indication by Syntactic-Semantic Analysis*, IEEE Proceedings of the 2007 Asia-Pacific Conference on Communications at pp. 237-40 (2007) Ute Römer, *Where the Computer Meets Language, Literature, and Pedagogy: Corpus Analysis in English* Studies, in How Globalization Affects the Teaching of English: Studying Culture Through Texts at pp. 81-109 (Andrea & Anja Müller-Wood eds.) (2006). Gregory Garretson and Mary Catherine O'Connor, *Between the Humanist and the Modernist: Semi-automated Analysis of Linguistic Corpora*, in Corpus Linguistics Beyond the Word, at 87-106 (2007). *IEEE at a Glance*, Inst. Electrical and Electronic Engineers (last visited 9/12/21). *About the ACM Organization*, Assoc. for Computing Machinery (last visited 9/12/21).

U.S. Patent No. 8,341,157				
No.	Claim Term	Claims	Proposed Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
				Defendant reserves the right to identify, designate, and rely upon expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence to rebut any expert testimony and/or other extrinsic evidence relied upon by Plaintiff. Defendant also reserves the right to rely on intrinsic evidence in rebuttal to Plaintiff's position.